

REMARKS

The courtesy of Examiner Young in granting a telephone interview with attorney Edward Callan on 25 August 2008 is sincerely appreciated. During the interview currently amended independent claims 9 and 33 and the essence of the arguments presented herein were discussed. No agreement was reached as to the allowability of the claims. The Examiner indicated that she planned to conduct a further search with respect to the amended independent claims.

Claims 9 and 33 are amended to better point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present invention.

Support for the term “defined” is provided in paragraphs [0022], [0029], and [0032] of the Specification as published (US 2006/0068845 A1). The present invention is more particularly pointed out by use of the term “defined” than by use of the term “fixed”.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 103

The rejection of claims 9-33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson et al. in view of Lipsanen et al. is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons:

Wilson does not suggest configuring a SIM card in such a manner that with the SIM card the terminal device can be *connected* to *only defined* destination or source addresses, or both, as required by claim 9. Examples of such defined destination and source addresses are recited in the Specification and in the dependent claims as phone numbers, URLs (Uniform Resource Locators) and APN's (Access Point Names).

Wilson does not suggest *limiting* use of a mobile telecommunications terminal device by using in the terminal device a SIM card that permits connections only to *defined* destination or source addresses, or both, as required by claim 33. This feature

permits the mobile phone subscriber relationship associated with the SIM card to be limited to a defined virtual private network (VPN).

In paragraph [0129], Wilson discloses the use of a SIM card in a mobile device for storing a first list of the mobile device user's friends who may receive, via a telecommunications network, a current location of the user's mobile device; a second list of the user's friends who have permitted the user's mobile device to receive, via the network, a location of wireless devices associated with the user's friends; and a third "deny always" list of friends to whom the user wishes to always deny his or her location. See also paragraphs [0137], [0138], and [0151] and claims 1 and 32 of Wilson.

Wilson is directed to managing permissions for distributing mobile-device-*location* information, not permissions for *connecting mobile devices to* destination and/or source addresses, as required by independent claims 9 and 33 of the present application.

In paragraph [0065], Lipsanen describes the use of a SIM card in a mobile communication device for storing parameters for authentication and billing. *Authentication* is not equivalent to *connection*.

Wilson does not suggest that the defined destination and source addresses to which the terminal device can be *connected* are stored in a memory of the SIM card or in a database of a mobile communication network, as required by claims 9 and 33.

Wilson does not suggest limiting the *destination and/or source addresses* to which a terminal device of a mobile telecommunications network can be *connected*, as required by claims 9 and 33. Instead, Wilson discloses limiting the distribution of *information indicating the current location* of a user's wireless phone.

Whereas Wilson discloses *limiting the distribution of wireless-phone-location-information* in accordance with information stored in SIM card in a user's wireless phone; the present invention *limits the connection* of a mobile telecommunications

terminal device to only *defined destination and/or source addresses* that are stored in the SIM card or in a database of the mobile telecommunications network.

The combined teachings of Wilson and Lipsanen neither describe nor suggest the present invention.

Claims 10 – 32 depend from claim 9 and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as are claims 9 and 33.


Conclusion

Applicants do not necessarily agree with any of the Examiner's comments regarding the applicability of the cited references to any of the claims. However, in view of the reasons presented herein for traversing the rejections of the claims, applicants are not presenting additional arguments at this time. Applicants reserve the right to present additional arguments for traversing the present and any future rejections of the claims.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 9-33 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dietmar Muller et al.

By: 
Lawrence A. Maxham
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 24,483

The Maxham Firm
A Professional Corporation
9330 Scranton Road, Suite 350
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 587-7659
Facsimile: (858) 587-7658